UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

VIACOM INTERNATIONAL, INC., COMEDY) PARTNERS, COUNTRY MUSIC TELEVISION, INC., PARAMOUNT PICTURES CORPORATION, and BLACK ENTERTAINMENT TELEVISION LLC, Plaintiffs,)Case No. 1:07CV02103 VS. YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC, and GOOGLE, INC., Defendants. THE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION PREMIER LEAGUE LIMITED, BOURNE CO., et al.,) on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs,)Case No. 07CV3582 VS. YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC, and GOOGLE, INC., Defendants.

DEPOSITION OF MICAH SCHAFFER

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 2008

REPORTED BY:

YVONNE FENNELLY, CRP, CSR NO. 5495 JOB NO. 15376

1	
_	

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LEAD PLAINTIFFS AND PROSPECTIVE CLASS:

PROSKAUER ROSE, LLP By: HAL S. SHAFTEL, Attorney at Law 1585 Broadway New York, California 90067-3206

(212) 969-3230 (212) 969-2900

hshaftel@proskauer.com

FOR THE PLAINTIFF VIACOM INTERNATIONAL, INC.:

JENNER & BLOCK, LLP JAMES COX, Attorney at Law 1099 New York Avenue, NW Suite 900

Washington, DC 20001 (202) 639-6000 (202) 661-4916

JamesCox@jenner.com

FOR THE CLASS PLAINTIFFS:

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP By: DAVID S. STELLINGS, Attorney at Law 780 Third Avenue 48th Floor New York, New York 10017-2024 (212) 355-9500

(212) 355-9592 dstellings@lchb.com

		4
1		
2	APPEARANCES (Continued):	
3		
4	FOR THE DEFENDANTS YOUTUBE, INC., YOUTUBE, LLC and	
5	GOOGLE, INC.:	
6	MAYER BROWN, LLP BY: ANDREW H. SCHAPIRO, Attorney at Law DAVID McGILL, Attorney at Law	
7	1675 Broadway New York, New York 10019	
8	(212) 506-2500	
9	aschapiro@mayerbrown.com	
10		
11	FOR GOOGLE, INC.:	
12	GOOGLE, INC. BY: ADAM L. BAREA, Litigation Counsel	
13	1600 Amphitheatre Parkway Mountain View, California 94043 (650) 214-4879	
14	(650) 214-4079 (650) 618-1806 adambarea@google.com	
15	addinbarea(googre.com	
16	ALSO PRESENT: Kelly Truelove, consultant;	
17	Lou Meadows, Videographer	
18	000	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Γ

```
2
    02:03 Premier League content?
3
    02:03
             Α.
                  These are very different times,
    02:03 chronologically. This e-mail is from May 2006. Our
    02:03 site was a very different size then, and we were a small
6
    02:03 company still figuring out exactly what the appropriate
7
    02:03 balance was and how to scale things like this.
8
    02:03
                   So one of the things that we discovered as we
9
    02:03 were doing this -- and of course we were doing this
10
    02:03 because -- we were doing this for the RIAA because we
11
    02:03 wanted to be helpful; right? We wanted to work with
12
    02:03 content owners, and especially when they first signed up
13
    02:03 for it, I imagine, you know, there was somewhat of a
14
    02:04 backlog when they first began removing their content
15
    02:04 from YouTube. There has got to be, you know, some extra
16
    02:04 content that had been previously uploaded, and we
17
    02:04 didn't -- you know, we felt that it would be a good
18
    02:04 service to provide to them to, you know, to try to help
19
    02:04 them with that burden.
20
    02:04
                  But what we found over time was that, first, we
21
    02:04 weren't very good at it. We couldn't tell, you know,
22
    02:04 what was authorized or not. We really wouldn't know
23
    02:04 necessarily who had uploaded it. We wouldn't know
24
    02:04 whether particular videos were authorized or if, like,
25
    02:04 NBC -- NBC is a great example of someone who was using
```

```
2 | 02:10 scans, sure.
```

- 3 02:10 Q. Do you recall any discussions about whether or
- 4 | 02:10 not to continue the practice?
- $5 \mid 02:10$ A. I don't recall.
- $6 \mid 02:10$ Q. You mentioned that one aspect of proactive
- 7 | 02:10 scanning involves the potential misidentifications or
- 8 | 02:10 incorrect decisions; is that right?
- 9 02:10 A. Absolutely.
- 02:10 Q. Were you involved in or aware of any analysis
- 11 02:10 that YouTube did as to the extent of misidentifications
- 12 02:10 from proactive scanning?
- 13 02:10 A. I don't recall any specifically.
- 02:10 Q. To be more particular about the point, do you
- 15 | 02:10 recall anybody at YouTube doing any analysis to see
- 16 02:11 quantitatively how often misidentifications occurred
- 17 02:11 from proactive scanning?
- 18 02:11 A. I think it was more anecdotal.
- $19 \mid 02:11$ Q. You referred to difficulties with scalability
- 20 02:11 as videos on the site grew; is that correct?
- 21 02:11 A. Sure.
- 22 02:11 Q. Do you recall any analysis at YouTube as to the
- 23 02:11 viability of proactive scanning to remove content with
- 24 | 02:11 the increased traffic and number of videos at the site?
- $25 \mid 02:11$ A. I think it was more of a general notion that

DAVID FELDMAN WORLDWIDE, INC.

Page 98 1 02:30 2. scanned for American Idol? 02:31 Α. On occasions. 02:31 Were you involved in proactive scans for 02:31 American Idol? 02:31 On occasions. 02:31 And what occasions would give rise to the Q. 02:31 proactive scans? 02:31 Α. We had been in -- some of this is probably 02:31 10 privileged. 02:31 11 MR. SCHAPIRO: Can you give as much of an 02:31 12 answer as you can without discussing any legal advice 02:31 13 that you received or sought? 02:31 14 THE WITNESS: Yes, I can try to be general 02:31 15 enough. 02:31 So we had been working with -- I believe it's 02:31 17 Fremantle owns American Idol. They were very adamant --02:32 18 they were very upset by the presence of content that 02:32 19 they felt -- or content that they owned that was being 02:32 20 uploaded to YouTube. And we would ask them, plead with 02:32 21 them really for URL's, for specific links, for specific 02:32 indications what content they were talking about, and 02:32 23 they were not very cooperative. They refused to provide 02:32 24 on most occasions specific information and were 02:32 25 threatening to sue us on a fairly regular basis on very

DAVID FELDMAN WORLDWIDE, INC.

Page 99

1

02:32

02:32	3	know, right around the time of course it's a cyclical
02:32	4	show; right, it's a series. So right during the time a
02:33	5	show would air they would come down; they would get
02:33	6	particularly more upset.

strong terms. And particularly this would happen, you

02:33 And, you know, in August we were still -- you know, we hadn't been bought by Google yet. We were very 02:33 02:33 resource constrained. And even though we were operating 02:33 10 within the law, my feeling at least, and I imagine the 02:33 11 feeling of others was that a lawsuit would be very bad 02:33 12 and that we might not be able to adequately defend 02:33 13 ourselves. So even though I don't think we were 02:33 obligated to go scan and guess which content was 02:33 15 American Idol, and I know mistakes were made because 02:34 there is many different idol shows around the world, 02:34 17 there are parodies, there are lots of videos. 02:34 18 people, you know, singing in their bathrooms or their 02:34 19 bedrooms, and they would tag it American Idol because 02:34 20 they are doing their best, you know, or they're 02:34 21 commenting on American Idol, and things like that. 02:34 22 sometimes, you know, inevitably those videos would get 02:34 23 swept up in this, but we kept doing those scans for a 02:34 24 time simply because it was -- you know, if we had gotten 02:34 25 sued at that point, even though we were doing nothing

DAVID FELDMAN WORLDWIDE, INC.

Page 100 1 02:34 2 wrong, it wouldn't necessarily matter that we were in 02:34 the right because we didn't necessarily have the 02:34 resources to adequately defend ourselves, so, you know, 02:34 they bullied us. And even though we really -- and the 02:34 irony is we really wanted to cooperate. We really 02:34 genuinely wanted their content down; and, that's why in 02:35 the end we'd grudgingly do these searches for them even 02:35 though it really wasn't the most effective use. 02:35 10 We offered them the tool repeatedly, you know, 02:35 11 our content verification program. We pleaded with them 02:35 12 to work with us. And we really, you know, sort of, in 02:35 13 the absence of their cooperation, we bent over backwards 02:35 trying to accommodate them. 14 02:35 15 Did you speak to anyone at Fremantle? 02:35 16 MR. SCHAPIRO: When? 02:35 17 BY MR. SHAFTEL: 02:35 18 By August of 2006, about their concerns over Q. 02:35 the infringing content on the site? 19 02:35 2.0 Α. I don't know if I personally had contact with 02:35 21 them directly. And again, getting into privilege, I 02:35 22 would be hesitant to characterize my knowledge of other 02:35 23 communications. 02:35 24 MR. SCHAPIRO: Don't answer further.

DAVID FELDMAN WORLDWIDE, INC.

02:35

25

BY MR. SHAFTEL:

DAVID FELDMAN WORLDWIDE, INC.

Ο.

Page 105 1 02:43 2. proactive scanning to remove content after the acquisition by Google in November of 2006? 02:43 02:43 I don't recall specifically. I quess it comes 02:43 back to exactly what we mean by "proactive." 02:43 If being threatened and prompted and instructed 02:43 by Fremantle, for instance, and then taking action based on the information they provided and conveyed and 02:43 02:43 requested, I would say, then, I do recall that 02:44 10 happening. I forget the level of detail. I know 02:44 11 eventually they began providing us with more detailed 02:44 12 information about what they would like removed, and we 02:44 13 responded, you know, to those requests. 02:44 14 I don't recall with regard specifically to 02:44 15 proactively searching for content without prompting in 02:44 16 that regard. 02:44 So I can understand, you recall searching for 17 02:44 18 Fremantle content to remove without specific URL's from 02:45 19 Fremantle or DMCA notice after the Google acquisition; 02:45 is that correct? 20 02:45 21 I believe so. 02:45 I believe there were instances where they 02:45 23 provided -- I know at some point they began -- I 02:45 24 remember receiving, I think it was like a printout of

DAVID FELDMAN WORLDWIDE, INC.

search results that Fremantle had provided and doing

02:45

25

Page 106

- 02:45 2 removals based on that. And I know there was some back 02:45 3 and forth around that.
- Q. Do you recall doing that for anyone else besides Fremantle after the Google acquisition?
- 02:45 6 A. I believe there were probably others.
- 02:45 7 Q. Who do you recall?
- 02:45 And to varying degrees, of course; right? Α. 02:45 said earlier, we regularly remove content without 02:46 10 fully -- without fully formed technically valid DMCA 02:46 11 takedown notices. And it's kind of a spectrum of, you 02:46 12 know, of the amount of specificity and the amount of 02:46 13 technical accuracy, and we try to respond appropriately based on the circumstances. And I know we've removed a 02:46 14
- 02:46 15 substantial amount of Viacom content without fully 02:46 16 formed DMCA notices as well.
- Q. Do you recall removing Viacom content that was uploaded after the date of whatever communication you're relying on, even if it's not, as you put it, a fully
- 02:47 20 formed DMC notice?
- 02:47 21 MR. SCHAPIRO: Objection; vague, ambiguous.
- 02:47 22 BY MR. SHAFTEL:
- Q. You've described the situation where a content over the owner submits a notification that I believe you put it,
- $^{02:47}$ 25 is not fully formed; it may have some technical defect.

DAVID FELDMAN WORLDWIDE, INC.

Page 132 1 03:27 know, fraud detection and spam and things like that. 03:28 YouTube has not yet fully integrated with 03:28 Google's account management system. I believe we have 03:28 plans to in the near term, and it involves a lot of 03:28 other moving pieces, but to the extent possible, we try 03:28 to leverage that system. 03:28 BY MR. SHAFTEL: 03:28 9 Ο. Thank you. 03:28 10 You had testified earlier today about MD5 03:28 11 hashes. 03:28 12 Am I correct that when content is removed 03:28 13 pursuant to the DMCA process, YouTube then takes some 03:28 14 action based on MD5 hashes? 03:28 15 Α. Yes. 03:28 16 How does it work? 03:28 17 So when content is removed for terms of use 03:29 18 violation or in response to a copyright notification, 03:29 19 our system automatically implements a block on the 03:29 20 originally uploaded files, MD5 hash. 03:29 21 Do the MD5 hashes, have they ever at YouTube 03:29 22 operated to delete videos that were existing on the 03:29 23 system before the video that is taken down? 03:29 24 So the question is about preexisting? Α. 03:29 25 Exactly. Ο.

DAVID FELDMAN WORLDWIDE, INC.

```
2 04:56 Are you aware of any ideas that were expressed
```

- 3 04:56 within YouTube or then Google post-acquisition to detect
- 4 04:56 or exclude copyrighted infringing material on a site
- $5 \mid 04:56$ that the company didn't implement?
- 6 04:56 A. You said "detect," or is there another part?
- 7 04:56 O. Exclude. Block.
- 8 04:56 A. So it involved blocking as a result of
- 9 04:56 detecting?
- 10 04:56 Q. (Nods head.)
- 11 04:56 A. None that I can recall.
- 12 04:56 Q. I'd asked you earlier about private videos or
- 13 04:57 Friend Share videos.
- 14 04:57 A. Yes.
- 04:57 Q. Do you understand that to be a program where
- 16 04:57 the uploader can limit the number of visitors to the
- 17 04:57 uploader's video or site page?
- 18 04:57 A. I'm sorry?
- 19 04:57 Q. What's the private -- what's the private video
- 20 04:57 program? What does it mean?
- 21 04:57 A. Users can designate a video as private either
- 22 | $^{04:57}$ when they upload it or subsequently by altering their
- 23 04:57 preferences and allows the video to be viewed by a
- 24 | 04:57 limited audience of their choosing.
- 25 04:57 Q. And how are private videos monitored for your

```
2 05:40 MR. McGILL: Are we up to Exhibit 17 or 15?
```

- 3 05:40 THE WITNESS: The last one was 15.
- 4 05:40 MR. McGILL: So this should be 16.
- 5 05:41 THE WITNESS: Okay.
- 6 05:41 BY MR. COX:
- $7 \mid 05:41$ Q. In this declaration, Mr. Chen states that
- 8 | 05:41 YouTube does not manually screen videos before they are
- 9 05:41 made available through the service.
- 10 05:41 Do you agree with that statement?
- 05:41 A. So at the time of this declaration -- actually,
- $12 \mid 05:41$ I see the date of the hearing. I'm not sure when the
- 13 05:41 declaration was executed.
- 14 05:41 January 5th, apparently, 2007. I don't believe
- 15 | 05:41 that was our standard practice, no.
- 16 05:41 Q. I'm sorry. To clarify, you don't believe that
- 17 | 05:41 screening videos manually before they were made
- $18 \mid 05:41$ available was your standard practice? So you agree with
- 19 05:42 the statement?
- 20 05:42 A. I don't believe that was our practice.
- 05:42 Q. Do you know of any other time when that was
- 22 | 05:42 your practice?
- 23 05:42 A. I think the sentence is slightly ambiguous. I
- 24 05:42 wouldn't want to preclude the kinds of things we
- 25 | 05:42 discussed earlier with regards to private videos, though

- 2 | 05:42 I suppose those were available. So no, I guess I'm not
- 3 05:42 aware of any circumstances.
- 4 | $^{05:42}$ Q. After the videos were made available through
- 5 | $^{05:42}$ the service at the time of this declaration, were you
- 6 | 05:42 aware of efforts YouTube was making to manually screen
- 7 | 05:43 videos?
- 8 05:43 MR. SCHAPIRO: Objection to the form of the
- $9 \mid 05:43 \text{ question.}$
- 10 05:43 THE WITNESS: Well, again, I think the term
- 11 | 05:43 "manually screen videos" is ambiguous.
- 12 05:43 BY MR. SHAFTEL:
- 13 05:43 Q. In what way?
- 14 05:43 A. So I'm not sure -- it could mean any number of
- 15 | 05:43 things.
- 05:43 Q. What are the different things you think it
- 17 | 05:43 could mean?
- 18 05:43 A. It could refer to -- and again, we're talking
- 19 | 05:43 about after they're available through the service?
- 20 05:43 O. Yes.
- $21 \mid 05:43$ A. It could refer to when a content owner sends in
- 22 | 05:43 a nonspecific takedown notice, perhaps involving search
- 23 05:43 terms, or even search results that would require us to
- 24 | 05:44 go through and manually look through the content that's
- 25 | 05:44 being referred to.